

Interview Summary	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)
	09/520,264	WEAVER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Susan Y Chen	2161

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Susan Y Chen.

(3) Ellen M. Bierman.

(2) Uyen Le.

(4) Dennis M. de Guzman.

Date of Interview: 08 December 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 50.

Identification of prior art discussed: Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representatives point to Fig. 1 and explain that their client's invention is used in the discovery process for legal proceeding. Their system analyzes data for legal purpose. It processes documents from different sources for example hard disk, CD, floppy disk, paper, e-mail, and any storage mechanism through conversion engine (item 134 of Fig. 1) and store data in databases to facilitate searching. Claim 50 was discussed. The examiners pointed out that claim 50 does not require documents from different sources because it merely recites "receiving from an external information system... a plurality of electronic files". The examiners also pointed out that the role of the conversion engine 134 is not recited in claim 50. Applicant's representative Bierman answer to the examiners' first remark was "it doesn't matter". Applicants' representative de Guzman's answer to the examiners' later remark was : step 2 and 3 "receiving the received electronic files in a searchable format" and "storing and indexing metadata associated with the received electronic files while preserving directory structure information of the received data structure" recite such role. The examiners do not agree on such claim interpretations and do not agree that the claim language reflects applicant's invention.